

Appl. No.: 09/981,202
Amdt. dated April 26, 2004
Reply to Office action of February 9, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated February 9, 2004, in which the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 11-14 as anticipated by Nunn (U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,828); (2) rejected 3 and 15 as obvious over Nunn in view of Zimmer (Pat. Pub. 2003/0097581); and (3) concluded that dependent claims 4-6, 9-10, and 16-19 contain allowable subject matter. In this response, Applicant amends claims 2, 4, 8-11, 13, and 16 and cancel claims 1, 7 and 12.

Applicant changes dependent claim 4 into independent form and cancels independent claim 1. As such, the scope of claim 4 has not been narrowed. As the Examiner correctly concluded, none of the art of record discloses the combination of limitations in claim 4. Thus, claim 4 is in condition for allowance as are dependent claims 2 (amended to depend from claim 4 instead of canceled claim 1), 3, 5 and 6. Applicant also replaces the word "system" in claim 4 with "option" to correct an inadvertent error. This amendment was not made for reasons of patentability and did not narrow the scope of claim 4.

Applicant also changes dependent claim 8 into independent form and cancels independent claim 7. As such, the scope of claim 8 has not been narrowed. None of the art of record discloses the combination of limitations in claim 8. For instance, none of the art discloses that searching for an option ROM code includes "searching for a predefined value that indicates the location of a set of information...that includes a location value that is used to determine the location of the option ROM code." Thus, claim 8 is in condition for allowance as are dependent claims 9-11.

In amending claim 8 to include limitations from canceled claim 7, the use of the labels "(a)-(d)" has been avoided so as not imply that the claim limitations must be performed in the order listed. As a result, Applicant amends claims 9 and 10 to maintain consistency with claim 8. Applicant also amends claim 11 to depend from claim 8 instead of canceled claim 7.

Applicant amends claim 16 to place claim 16 in independent form, and cancels independent claim 12. As the Examiner correctly concluded, none of the art of record discloses the combination of limitations in claim 16. Thus, claim 16

Appl. No.: 09/981,202
Amtd. dated April 26, 2004
Reply to Office action of February 9, 2004

is in condition for allowance as are dependent claims 13-15 and 17-19. Applicant amends dependent claim 13 to depend from allowable claim 16 instead of canceled claim 12.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400